

## **Historic, Archive Document**

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



1.9  
Ec 752 Aim

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
Bureau of Agricultural Economics

---

**AGRICULTURAL IMPORTS**  
**CLASSIFIED ON THE BASIS OF THEIR**  
**COMPETITIVE NATURE AND TARIFF STATUS**

By

C. F. Wells  
Agricultural Economist

---

Washington, D. C.  
June 1937

## CONTENTS

## PAGE

	PAGE
Introduction .....	1
Summary .....	1 - 3
Imported agricultural products classified on the basis of whether the commodities are or are not also produced in the United States(table 1)	3
Imported agricultural products classified on the basis of whether the commodities do, or do not, compete with domestic farm products(table 2)	4 - 5
Competitive agricultural imports subdivided into two groups: Commodities produced in the United States and those not produced in the United States (table 3) .....	5
Competitive agricultural imports subdivided into two classes: Commodities used extensively by farmers as producers, and all others (table 4) .....	5
Agricultural imports classified on the basis of the effect of a change in their duties on prices of domestic farm products .....	6
Group A - Noncompetitive agricultural imports .....	6
Group B - Competitive imports that are so small that their elimination would not raise the price of the related domestic farm product more than 1 percent (table 5) ...	6 - 7
Group C - Competitive imports that compete with domestic farm products, <u>different in kind or quality</u> , which are either on an export or on an import basis (table 6) ...	7 - 9
Group D - Competitive imports that compete with domestic farm products, <u>different in kind or quality</u> , which <u>do not</u> enter into foreign trade (table 7) .....	9
Group E - Competitive imports identical in kind and quality with the domestically produced portion of the supply(table 8) .	9
Summary of the classification of agricultural imports on the basis of the probable effect of an increase in their duties on the prices of domestic farm products (table 9) .....	9 - 10
The tariff status of agricultural imports (table 10) .....	10
Tables 1 - 10 .....	11 - 22
Appendix I - Imported agricultural products classified on the basis of whether or not the commodities are also produced in the United States and whether or not they are substituted for domestic farm products, average 1924-25 to 1928-29, 1929-30 to 1932-33, and 1934-35 .....	23 - 30

**AGRICULTURAL IMPORTS CLASSIFIED ON THE BASIS OF THEIR  
COMPETITIVE NATURE AND TARIFF STATUS**

By C. F. Wells, Agricultural Economist

Introduction

The purpose of this report is to contribute material of a descriptive and analytical nature which will promote a better understanding of the nature of the agricultural products that are being imported into the United States and their relation to domestic agriculture. In this report agricultural imports are classified in four ways: (1) those commodities which are also produced in the United States and those which are not; (2) those commodities which compete with domestic farm products and those which do not; (3) those whose tariff status is a factor affecting the price of competitive domestic farm products; and (4) those which are free of duty and those which are dutiable. The report deals only with the direct effects of duty changes. No attempt is made to analyze the many indirect effects of such duty changes on domestic agriculture and on foreign trade in agricultural products. Such indirect effects become evident through changes not only in farm prices, but also in other factors such as the quantity of farm production, the purchasing power available abroad for buying American agricultural exports, and the tariffs and other barriers imposed by foreign governments on United States agricultural trade.

Summary

The first of the four classifications of agricultural imports presented herein indicates that during the depression and the 5 years preceding it, about 60 percent of agricultural imports consisted of articles like coffee, rubber, silk, bananas, cocoa, etc., of which there is no domestic production (table 1). Elimination of the imports of these items would not cause many of them to be produced in this country, because most of the items in this class require tropical conditions of production not available within the continental United States.

Part of the imported agricultural products of which there is no domestic production are indirectly competitive as substitutes for domestic farm products. The items of which there was no domestic production but which competed as substitutes with domestic farm products made up about 15 percent of the total value of competitive agricultural imports (table 3). The remainder of the competitive imports is made up of imports of agricultural products of which there is a domestic production. In the 5 years before the depression and during the depression, competitive imports averaged about 40 percent of the total value of agricultural imports (table 2). The principal competitive agricultural imports ranked according to their value in the periods mentioned were sugar and molasses; vegetable oils and oilseed edible and inedible other than flaxseed; hides and skins; tobacco; wool not used for carpets; cotton; flaxseed; cheese; and cattle and beef. These products accounted for 78 percent of the total value of competitive agricultural imports in the two periods.

About 5 percent of competitive imports was made up of products used extensively by farmers as producers. These included such items as feed grains, fodders and feeds, hay, jute for bagging, garden and field seeds, and live-stock for breeding (table 4).

- 21 -

The competitive nature of a product is only one factor that determines the effect of a change in duty upon the price of the domestic farm product with which the imported product competes. An imported product must be competitive if a change in its duty is to have any effect on the price of the domestic farm product but the extent of the effect is often modified, and in some cases entirely offset, by other factors. One of these modifying factors is the directness of the competition, that is, whether the imported product competes directly with a like domestic product or indirectly as a substitute for a somewhat different domestic product. If the imported product competes indirectly then the presence or absence of substantial exports or imports of the domestic product will be a factor modifying the effect of changes in the duty. Another factor which may, in certain cases, set an outside limit to the price changes that could be expected is the ratio of imports to domestic production. If imports are a very small fraction of the domestic supply their reduction or elimination could have but slight effect on the price of domestic farm products.

It would seem to be desirable to subdivide agricultural imports into groups on the basis of the effect of changes in their duties on the prices of the domestic farm products with which the imports compete. To do this with the maximum degree of accuracy would require complete knowledge concerning the extent and nature of competition here and abroad between imported and domestic farm products. Full information of this kind is not available, but an attempt has been made, on the basis of such data as are at hand, to set up such a classification of agricultural imports. As in many cases it was found necessary to rely on incomplete information in sorting the imported products into the various groups, it follows that the results are tentative and subject to modification as further information becomes available.

This tentative classification of agricultural imports on the basis of the probable price effects of changes in their duties leads to the following conclusions for the 4-year period beginning July 1, 1929. (Percentages in each class are minimums since about 8 percent of imports were not classified.)

- (1) At least 54 percent of the agricultural imports in terms of value do not compete with domestic farm products either directly or indirectly, and therefore changes in the duties on these imports would not tend to raise or lower the price of domestic farm products appreciably.
- (2) At least 38 percent of the agricultural imports were competitive and were subdivided into four groups, B, C, D and E on the basis of the degree to which changes in their duties would affect prices of domestic agricultural products. A restriction of imports of products in group B, representing less than 1 percent of total agricultural imports, would raise prices of domestic farm products only a negligible amount. Changes in the duties on products in Class C would also have a negligible effect on the prices of the domestic farm products. Groups B and C

combined represent at least 15 percent of total agricultural imports, and the domestic products with which they compete were the source of about 60 percent of cash farm income in the period mentioned (table 9).

- (3) Changes in the duties on products in groups D. and E, representing at least 24 percent of agricultural imports, would have had some effect, the extent of which is unknown, on the prices of the domestic farm products with which they compete. Products in groups D and E competed with domestic farm products from which about 25 percent of cash farm income was derived (table 9).

The proportion of imports free and dutiable in certain of the classes into which agricultural imports have been subdivided are shown in table 10. The tariff status of each of the principal agricultural imports is shown in Appendix I. These tabulations show that the products which were free of duty and excise taxes on imports on September 1, 1936 constituted around 66 percent of total agricultural imports, around 99 percent of noncompetitive agricultural imports, and from 20 to 30 percent of competitive agricultural imports in the 9 years beginning July 1, 1924.

Imported Agricultural Products Classified on the Basis of  
Whether Commodities Are or Are Not Also Produced in the  
United States

The principal agricultural imports of which there is no domestic production are coffee, rubber, silk, bananas, cocoa beans, tea, wool free of duty for carpets, coconut oil and copra, palm oil, tung oil, and certain spices. (For a complete list see classes I and II, appendix I.) In recent non-drought years, such products have constituted about 61 percent of total agricultural imports, in terms of value.

An examination of the agricultural imports of commodities of which there is no domestic production (classes I and II, appendix I) will support the conclusion that the entire elimination of all imports of these items would not cause the beginning of production of many of them in this country. This is because most of them require tropical climatic conditions not available within the boundaries of the continental United States. In certain other cases, such as free carpet wool, domestic production would not be commenced because they are joint-supply products and because the resulting increase in output of the related joint products would depress the prices of these joint products.

But even though these imports are not directly competitive with either existing or potential domestic farm output of identical products, some of these imports are indirectly competitive as substitutes for American farm products. Therefore, if it is desired to compare noncompetitive agricultural imports on the one hand with the total indirectly and directly competitive agricultural imports on the other hand, it is necessary to reclassify the data on which table 1 is based in a somewhat different way.

Imported Agricultural Products Classified on the Basis  
of Whether The Commodities Do, or Do Not, Compete  
with Domestic Farm Products

The second classification of agricultural imports separates the products into two classes, competitive and noncompetitive. 1/

A noncompetitive agricultural import is a commodity of which none is produced in the continental United States and which is not substituted to a significant extent for any farm product which is produced in this country.

Competitive agricultural imports include indirectly competitive and directly competitive agricultural imports. An indirectly competitive agricultural import may be defined as a product none of which is produced in the continental United States but which is substituted to a significant extent for farm products that are produced in this country. A directly competitive agricultural import is here defined as an imported farm commodity of which some is also produced in this country.

It is apparent from the above definitions that only two basic criteria are involved in the various definitions; (a) Is the product imported also produced in this country?, and (b) If not, is the imported product substituted for domestic farm products? In most cases it is easy to determine whether an imported farm commodity is, or is not, also produced in the United States. But there are a few cases in which the characteristics of the imported product differ so markedly from those of the domestic product as to raise the question whether they should not be treated as different commodities. Imported Swiss cheese may be cited as an illustration of this type of borderline case.

The question of whether or not an imported agricultural product of which there is no domestic production is, or is not, substituted for some other farm product that is produced in this country is not always easy to decide. Many of the principal items (in terms of value) for which this decision must be made are clearly not substituted and have therefore been classified as noncompetitive. The principal items of this kind are coffee, rubber, cocoa beans, tea, certain spices, and certain drugs. There is general agreement that these items are not substituted for American farm products; or at least if they compete with domestic farm products for the consumer's dollar, their competition is no greater than that of strictly nonagricultural, noncompetitive products such as automobiles and radios.

But there are a few important agricultural imports of commodities that are not also produced in this country which are difficult to classify on the basis of whether they are or are not substituted for American farm products. The most important are silk, bananas, and jute. Silk and bananas

1/ The May 4, 1936 issue of Foreign Crops and Markets contained an article entitled "A classification of United States Agricultural Imports" in which the terms noncompetitive and competitive agricultural imports were defined in terms equivalent to those given above.

have been classified as noncompetitive and jute and jute butts as competitive. Silk is more of a substitute for rayon than for cotton or wool. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to isolate and evaluate the effect on cotton or wool prices of changes in the price of silk. Though the price effect of imports of bananas is probably confined to agricultural products, the effect is probably diffused over so many foodstuffs as to eliminate bananas as an important factor in the price of any one of them. Changes in the price of apples, a domestic commodity often mentioned as being affected, can be explained in large degree without reference to changes in the price or supply of bananas. On the other hand, to the extent that jute is substituted for domestic farm products, it is substituted for only one of them - cotton. It is therefore believed that unusual changes in the supply or price of jute would have a noticeable effect on the price of cotton.

There were many borderline cases among the less important imports, all of which were decided by placing the article in the competitive class.

About 55 percent of agricultural imports in pre-drought years consisted of noncompetitive products. In 1934-35 about 46 percent was non-competitive, the relative increase in competitive imports being due to the drought. Three products - silk, coffee, and rubber-accounted for from 80 to 83 percent of the total value of noncompetitive agricultural imports in the two periods and if bananas, cocoa beans, carpet wool free for carpets, and tea are added, these 7 items accounted for 94 percent in both periods. (Appendix I.)

In both of the periods the following 9 products or groups of products accounted for 78 percent of the value of competitive agricultural imports: sugar and molasses; vegetable oils and oil-bearing materials edible and inedible other than flaxseed; hides and skins; tobacco; wool not for carpets; cotton unmanufactured; flaxseed; cheese; and cattle and beef. (Appendix I, classes II and III.)

Competitive agricultural imports subdivided into two groups: Commodities produced in the United States and those not produced in the United States

Table 3 indicates that in the two periods under review from 14 to 17 percent of competitive agricultural imports was made up of commodities not also produced in this country which therefore competed indirectly as substitutes for domestic farm products rather than directly as additions to the supply. This subclass includes such items as certain vegetable fats and oils and oilbearing materials, jute and jute butts, carpet wool dutiable, tapioca and other farinaceous substances, etc. (See Appendix I, Class II).

Competitive agricultural imports subdivided into two classes: Commodities used extensively by farmers as producers, and all others. Certain agricultural imports, though competitive with domestic farm products, are used extensively by farmers in the processes of production. If imports of such products are an important fraction of domestic consumption, an increase in their price due to higher duties is likely to injure farmers as buyers more than it benefits farmers as sellers. The increase in the price injures farmer-buyers of both the home-grown and imported portions of the supply, whereas it benefits only the farmers that produce the home-grown portion of the supply. It has therefore been thought worthwhile to determine the relative importance of this class of competitive agricultural imports.

It was found that the principal items used extensively by farmers as producers were feed grains, oilcake and meal, other feeds, hay, jute, garden and field seeds, and livestock for breeding. These items accounted for about 5 percent of competitive agricultural imports in the two periods ended June 30, 1929 and 1933. In the fiscal year 1934-35, these items constituted 12.3 percent of competitive imports, the relative increase being due to the deficit in domestic supplies of feed grains and feedstuffs caused by the drought of 1934 (table 4).

Agricultural Imports Classified on the Basis of the Effect of a Change in Their Duties on Prices of Domestic Farm Products

Group A.-- The various classifications of agricultural imports that have previously been made in this report are of some value in estimating the probable effects of changes in duties on farm products, since they throw some light on the extent to which agricultural imports are competitive with domestic farm products. In fact, one of the classes already set up, namely, noncompetitive agricultural imports, will be transferred without any changes into the third classification of agricultural imports that is here developed. Noncompetitive imports were defined as products that are not produced in the United States and which are not substituted to a significant extent for domestic farm products.

Noncompetitive imports will constitute group A in the new classification. Group A includes such items as silk, coffee, rubber, and tea, most of which are now free of duty. (Appendix I, class I.) Of course, the entire exclusion from entry of an article like rubber might conceivably have some effect on the price of hides, but it is believed that any duty that might be laid on such products would be intended to raise revenue rather than to protect domestic industries indirectly affected, and therefore that any duty that might be laid on these items would not be such as to restrict imports substantially. It is therefore believed that such revenue duties would not affect prices of domestic farm products appreciably. Group A imports had an average value of \$604,226,000 in the 4 years 1929-30 through 1932-33, or 53.7 percent of the total value of agricultural imports. (Table 2.)

Turning to competitive imports, it would seem that the single fact that an imported product is competitive in the domestic market with an American farm product, is not in itself always sufficient to justify the conclusion that a change in the duty on that imported product would result in a change in the price of the domestic product with which it competes. Therefore, the class called "competitive agricultural imports" needs to be divided into subclasses on the basis of the probable effect of a change in duties on these products on the prices of the domestic farm products with which they compete.

Group B.-- Group B will include those competitive imports that are so small compared with the production of the domestic products affected that their elimination by means of new or higher duties would have a negligible effect on the prices of the domestic farm products. It is arbitrarily assumed that a 1-percent increase in the price of a domestic farm product is negligible, in the sense that if that were all that could be expected from higher tariffs farmers would not be particularly concerned.

The next question is, How small must imports be, compared with domestic production, in order that their elimination would not raise the price of the domestic product more than 1 percent?

An increase in the duty on an article that is being imported tends to raise the duty-paid price of the article and decrease the imports of the product, and tends to raise the price of the domestic product with which the import competes. But there is an upper limit beyond which the price of the domestic product cannot be forced by an increase in the duty. That is, the price at which imports cease.

Under any given conditions of supply and demand an increase in the duty cannot raise the prevailing price of the domestic product above the "no import" price because at the "no import" level the domestic production equals the domestic consumption and if the price were higher the domestic production would exceed the domestic consumption and the higher price could not be maintained unless a foreign outlet could be found at that price for the surplus; and this last cannot be expected to result from an increase in our duty.

If, now, the "no import" price is only 1 percent or less above the prevailing price of an article being imported, then no increase in duty, no matter how large, could raise the prevailing price more than 1 percent. The percentage by which the "no import" price of various agricultural products being imported exceeds the prevailing duty-paid price of those articles is, of course, not known. But except for commodities whose domestic demand and supply are both unusually inelastic it would seem reasonable to assume that if imports are very small compared with domestic production, the elimination of the imports would probably have very little effect upon domestic prices. In other words it seems reasonable to assume that in such cases the "no import" price is but slightly higher than the prevailing price. Merely to give this idea a more tangible form it has here been assumed that if imports are as small as one-fourth of 1 percent of domestic production the elimination of imports by means of higher duties or otherwise would not raise the prices of competitive domestic products more than 1 percent.

Table 5 contains some of the more important imports that fall within this group in the period mentioned. Important products included in this group are corn, oats, barley, rye, hay, butter, potatoes, hogs, pork, sheep, mutton, and apples. Imports of group B items had an average value of \$4,534,000 in the 4 fiscal years, 1929-30 through 1932-33, or less than one-half of 1 percent of the total value of agricultural imports (table 9). Though these items are not important import commodities, they include some very important sources of domestic farm income. In fact, the items with which group B imports compete were the source of over 40 percent of cash income from farm production in the 4 years concerned (table 9).

Group C.— This group will include those competitive agricultural imports that compete as substitutes with domestic products that are either on an export basis or on an import basis. It is believed that decreasing or increasing the imports by means of a change in duties, of a commodity that competes, as a substitute, with a domestic product that is either exported or imported will have much less effect on the price of that domestic product than would be the case if that product did not enter into international

trade. For instance, if the imports of commodity X are reduced by means of a duty and if commodity X competes as a substitute with a domestic farm product Y, then, if Y is either imported or exported and if X and Y are also substituted for each other in the foreign market, the effect on Y's price of the decrease in imports of X will be much less than it would be if Y were neither imported nor exported.

Imported long-staple cotton may be used to illustrate this principle. Imported long-staple is different in quality than domestic long-staple cotton, yet is substituted for domestic long-staple in certain uses under certain conditions, both in the domestic and in the foreign market. Domestic long-staple is being exported at the same time that foreign long-staple (Egyptian Uppers) is being imported. It is believed that the elimination of imports of foreign long-staple would have very much less effect on the price of domestic long-staple under these circumstances than it would if domestic long-staple were not being exported in substantial amounts. The same conclusion would be reached if the domestic product were on an import basis and a duty were placed on a substitute being imported.

For instance, both flaxseed and tung oil are being imported. It is believed the elimination of tung-oil imports would have a great deal less effect on the domestic price of flaxseed under these conditions than it would if flaxseed were not being imported. The conclusion in both the above cases rests on the reasoning that if the two commodities are substituted for each other in this country they are likely substituted for each other in foreign markets and that the effect of higher duties on, and reduced imports of, X on the domestic price of Y, is to tend to raise it, but that the effect on the foreign price of Y is in the opposite direction and these two effects tend to cancel each other as far as the price of Y is concerned. Therefore, it is believed that any given increase in duties on imports that meet the requirements of group C will increase the prices of comparable domestic farm products by a very small fraction of the increase in the duty, if at all.

Since, however, the validity of this conclusion rests on the assumption that the two products are in fact substitutes for each other both in the domestic and in the foreign markets, no commodity should be placed in group C unless there is a factual foundation for the conclusion that it meets this requirement. It must be stated that in the case of some of the imported products which are placed in group C in this report (table 6) the facts concerning the extent of actual substitution here and abroad are so incomplete as to justify only a tentative decision at this time. Additional information might necessitate a change in the classification of certain of the items here placed in group C.

Competitive agricultural imports that have been tentatively placed in group C in the 4 years ended June 30, 1933 are listed in table 6. The average value of group C imports in the 4 years 1929-30 through 1932-33 was \$158,945,000 or 14.1 percent of the total value of agricultural imports (table 9). Group C imports were more or less competitive as substitutes with domestic farm products from which about \$1,233,163,000 of cash farm income was derived in the average year of the 4-year period (table 6).

This \$1,233,163,000 represented about 18 percent of total cash farm income (table 9).

Group D.- This group will include those competitive agricultural imports which compete as substitutes with domestic farm products of a different kind or quality that are neither imported nor exported to an important extent. For reasons outlined in the preceding section it is believed that, other things being equal, a change in the duties on group D imports would have much more effect on the prices of the domestic products with which they compete than if those commodities entered substantially into foreign trade either as an export or as an import. In that respect group D items may be contrasted with group C items. Some of the principal agricultural imports that fall in group D are listed in table 7. The value of group D imports in the 4 years, 1929-30 through 1932-33 averaged \$66,961,000 or about 6 percent of the total value of agricultural imports (table 9). Group D items competed as substitutes with products from which about 7 percent of cash farm income was derived in the 4 years under review (table 9).

Group E.- consists of all agricultural imports which are of the same kind and quality as the domestic farm product with which they compete, except those included in group B. Since the imported portion of the supply is defined as commercially indistinguishable from the domestically produced portion, it would not, of course, be logical to expect any exports at the same time and place the imports enter. There might, of course, be simultaneous imports of a certain product into one part of the country or at one season of the year, and exports of the same kind of product from some other part of the country or at some other time of year. This is not true, however, of the imported products here classified in group E and therefore the following characterization of group E products need not be qualified. A change in duties on group E imports may be expected to have a greater effect on prices of domestic farm products than comparable changes in duties on products in the other groups. Even here, however, the incidence of the duty is not necessarily entirely on the domestic price. Part of the increase in duty may take the form of a fall in the foreign price. For instance, it has been estimated that even in the case of a commodity as homogeneous as sugar the domestic price would not increase by the full amount of an increase in the duty. Sugar is the principal import in group E. Other examples are given in table 8. Group E imports had an average value of \$197,539,000 in the 4 years, 1929-30 through 1932-33, or 17.6 percent of the total value of agricultural imports (table 9). Group E imports competed directly with identical domestic farm products from which \$1,206,984,000 of cash farm income was derived, or 17 percent of total cash farm income in the period concerned (table 9).

Summary.- The classification of agricultural imports into five groups A to E on the basis of the probable effect of changes in their duties on the prices of domestic farm products is summarized in table 9. About 8 percent of agricultural imports were not sorted into the five groups. In the 4 years beginning July 1, 1929, noncompetitive products constituted at least 54 percent of total agricultural imports and therefore changing the tariff

status of these items, practically all of which were free of duty, would have had no appreciable effect on the prices of domestic farm products.

Though the products placed in the remaining four groups were competitive, it does not follow that changes in the duties on all of these would have resulted in corresponding changes in the prices of the domestic farm products with which they compete. A restriction of imports of the competitive imports in group B would probably raise the prices of the domestic farm products directly concerned less than 1 percent and changes in the duties on the competitive imports in group C would also have very little effect on the prices of domestic farm products. Combined imports in groups B and C totaled at least 15 percent of agricultural imports and competed with domestic farm products from which almost 60 percent of cash income from farm production was obtained in the 4 years mentioned.

Changes in the duties on the competitive imports in groups D and E, representing at least 24 percent of agricultural imports would have had some effect, the extent of which would depend on many factors, on the prices of the domestic farm products with which they compete. Products in groups D and E competed with domestic farm products from which about 25 percent of cash farm income was derived (table 9).

#### The Tariff Status of Agricultural Imports

Both in the 5 years beginning July 1, 1924 and in the 4 depression pre-drought years beginning July 1, 1929, about 66 percent of total agricultural imports (including forest products) were free of duty and of excise taxes under title IV of the Revenue Act of 1934 as amended (table 10). In 1934-35 this percentage was reduced somewhat because imports of dutiable products produced in the United States were unusually large, due to the drought of 1934 and other reasons. One important reason such a large proportion of agricultural imports was, and still is, free of duty is that about 60 percent of the value of agricultural imports consists of commodities of which none is produced in the United States (table 1), and most of these are free of duty. The "not produced" classification includes the "noncompetitive" imports and the "indirectly competitive" imports. Over 99 percent of the agricultural imports which have been classified as "noncompetitive" in this report (silk, coffee, rubber, cocoa beans, etc.), were free of duty and other taxes on imports on September 1, 1936 (table 10, Class I). From 26 to 28 percent of the "indirectly competitive" imports such as tropical vegetable fibers, vegetable oils and oilseeds, etc. were free of duty and other taxes on imports (table 10, Class II). Turning to the "directly competitive" agricultural imports, or those imported agricultural products which are also produced in the United States, like tobacco, flaxseed, etc., it is found that from 70 to 80 percent are either dutiable or subject to an excise tax under title IV of the Revenue Act of 1934 as amended (table 10, Class III).

The tariff status of each of the principal imported agricultural products is given in Appendix I.

Table 1.- Value of agricultural imports by class, of commodities not produced and produced in the United States, specified years

Class	Year beginning July 1					
	Av. 1924-25		Av. 1929-30		1934-35	
	to 1928-29		to 1932-33			
	: Percent-	: Percent-	: Percent-	: Percent-	: Percent-	: Percent-
	: age of :	: age of :	: age of :	: age of :	: age of :	: age of :
	: Value grand :	: Value grand :	: Value grand :	: Value grand :	: Value grand :	: Value grand :
	: total :	: total :	: total :	: total :	: total :	: total :
	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
	: dollars	: Percent	: dollars	: Percent	: dollars	: Percent
<u>Agricultural imports:</u>						
Not also produced in U.S. 1/	1,378,023	61.3	682,392	60.6	489,248	52.4
Also produced in U.S. 2/	764,224	34.0	393,249	35.0	381,942	40.9
Total classified .....	2,142,247	95.3	1,075,641	95.6	871,190	93.3
Total not classified 3/	105,672	4.7	49,052	4.4	62,806	6.7
Grand total 4/	2,247,919	100.0	1,124,693	100.0	933,996	100.0

- 1/ A list of the imported products included is given in Appendix I, Classes I and II.  
 2/ A list of the imported products included is given in Appendix I, Class III.  
 3/ Because of inability to separate free and dutiable in basket clauses.  
 4/ Excluding forest products.

Table 2.- Value of agricultural imports by class, noncompetitive and competitive with domestic farm products, specified years

Class	Year beginning July 1					
	Av. 1924-25		Av. 1929-30		1934-35	
	to 1928-29		to 1932-33			
	: Percent-	: Percent-	: Percent-	: Percent-	: Percent-	: Percent-
	: age of :	: age of :	: age of :	: age of :	: age of :	: age of :
	: Value grand :	: Value grand :	: Value grand :	: Value grand :	: Value grand :	: Value grand :
	: total :	: total :	: total :	: total :	: total :	: total :
	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
	: dollars	: Percent	: dollars	: Percent	: dollars	: Percent
<u>Agricultural imports:</u>						
Noncompetitive 1/	1,254,845	55.8	604,226	53.7	431,776	46.2
Competitive 2/	887,402	39.5	471,415	41.9	439,414	47.1
Total classified .....	2,142,247	95.3	1,075,641	95.6	871,190	93.3
Total not classified 3/	105,672	4.7	49,052	4.4	62,806	6.7
Grand total 4/	2,247,919	100.0	1,124,693	100.0	933,996	100.0

- 1/ Defined as imported agricultural products of which there is no domestic production and which are not substituted for domestic farm products. A list of the products included in this class is given in Appendix I, Class I.  
 2/ Defined as imports of agricultural products of which there is no domestic production, but which are substituted for domestic farm products, plus imports of commodities which are also produced in this country. A list of products included is given in Appendix I, Classes II and III.  
 3/ Because of inability to separate free and dutiable in basket clauses.  
 4/ Excluding forest products.

Table 3.- Value of competitive agricultural imports, by class competing indirectly and directly, with domestic farm products, specified years

Class	Year beginning July 1					
	Av. 1924-25 to 1928-29	Percent- age of Value total competitive imports	Av. 1929-30 to 1932-33	Percent- age of Value total competitive imports	1934-35	
	1,000 dollars	Percent	1,000 dollars	Percent	1,000 dollars	Percent
<u>Competitive agricultural imports:</u>						
Imports of agricultural products of which there is no domestic production but which are substituted for domestic farm products <u>1/</u> .....	123,178	13.9	78,166	16.6	57,472	13.1
Imports of agricultural products which are also produced in the United States <u>2/</u> .....	764,224	86.1	393,249	83.4	381,942	86.9
Total .....	887,402	100.0	471,415	100.0	439,414	100.0
Total classified imports ...	2,142,247		1,075,641		871,190	
Total unclassified imports <u>3/</u> .....	105,672		49,052		62,806	
Grand total <u>4/</u> .....	2,247,919		1,124,693		933,996	

1/ A list of the products included is given in Appendix I, Class II.

2/ A list of the products included is given in Appendix I, Class III.

3/ Because of inability to separate free and dutiable in basket clauses.

4/ Excluding forest products.

Table 4.- Value of competitive agricultural imports subdivided into the classes; those used extensively by farmers as producers, and all others, specified years

Class	Tariff and tax status	Year beginning July 1					
		Average 1924-25 to 1928-29		Average 1929-30 to 1932-33		1934-35	
		Percent-	Value	Percent-	Value	Value	Per-
		1,000 dollars	Per- cent	1,000 dollars	Per- cent	1,000 dollars	Per- cent
<u>Competitive agricultural imports used extensively by farmers as producers</u> <sup>2/</sup>							
Jute and jute butts...	F	12,229		4,579		3,307	
Garden and field seeds:							
dutiable .....	D	9,008		3,580		3,939	
Nursery stock .....	D	7,954		5,151		2,888	
Sugar beet seed .....	F	1,331		1,319		2,244	
Corn .....	D	2,131		441		10,703	
Barley .....	D	4		67		8,367	
Oats .....	D	384		49		4,557	
Wheat unfit for human consumption .....	D	<u>3/</u>		48		5,732	
Bran and other by-product feeds .....	D	6,434		3,755		6,979	
Oilcake and meal other than from copra .....	D	2,792		2,040		2,895	
Beet pulp, dried .....	D	891		809		521	
Hay .....	D	1,545		427		861	
Cattle for breeding ..	F	897		797		807	
Horses for breeding ..	F	<u>4/</u> 1,272		546		302	
Total .....		46,872	5.3	23,608	5.0	54,102	12.3
<u>Other competitive agricultural imports</u> .....		840,530	94.7	447,807	95.0	385,312	87.7
<u>Total competitive agricultural imports</u> .....		887,402	100.0	471,415	100.0	439,414	100.0

<sup>1/</sup> D signifies that as of September 1, 1936 the item was either dutiable or subject to an excise tax under Title IV of the Revenue Act of 1934 as amended, or both. F signifies the item is subject to neither. <sup>2/</sup> Used either in the form imported or in a more advanced form. <sup>3/</sup> Not separately reported prior to June 18, 1930, but dutiable and included in "wheat, full duty" listed under grains. <sup>4/</sup> Average 1925-26 to 1928-29.

Table 5.- Group B.- Principal competitive agricultural imports averaging 1/4 percent or less of domestic production, average 1929-30 to 1932-33

Farm products	Unit:	Year beginning July 1					
		Average 1929-30 to 1932-33					
		Value of imports	Quantity of imports		Domestic production		
			Total	Percent of domestic production	Quantity	farm income	Cash
		1,000 dollars	Thousands	Percent	Thousands	1,000 dollars	
Hogs	lb.	16	1/ 186)	0.09	2/ 5,662,410	3/ 796,788	
Pork, all forms	"	1,367	4,941)				
Corn	bu.	441	706	0.03	2,524,050	202,686	
Barley	"	67	199	0.07	271,145	26,062	
Oats	"	49	218	0.02	1,192,314	65,732	
Rye	"	11	22	0.06	38,672	8,251	
Hay	s.t.	427	51	0.06	79,452	88,590	
Butter	lb.	497	1,752	0.11	1,666,192	5/ 437,266	
Milk, condensed & evaporated	"	102	1,461	0.07	1,958,447	5/ 57,809	
Wheat	bu.	6/ 57	6/ 121	0.01	847,473	384,093	
Sheep, lambs, & goats	lb.	31	7/ 116)				
Mutton & lamb	"	71	551)	0.10	8/ 659,776	118,797	
Poultry dead, dr. weight basis	"	926	3,374	0.15	9/ 2,227,854	10/ 298,701	
Apples, fresh	bu.	220	122	0.13	11/ 95,403	112,928	
Cottonseed and products		12/ 170					80,187
Oranges	bxs.	82	26	0.05	47,356	83,541	
Strawberries	crtcs.	13/	13/				11,832
Sweetpotatoes	bu.	14/	14/				45,302
Peaches	bu.	13/	13/				64,888
Lettuce	crtcs.	13/	13/				30,451
							54,438
							33,155
							19,355
							15/ 30,339
Total Group B		4,534					2,900,678
Total Groups A-E		1,032,205					
Grand total		16/ 1,124,693					17/ 7,039,473

Continued

Table 5.- Group B.- Principal competitive agricultural imports averaging 1/4 percent or less of domestic production, average 1929-30 to 1932-33-  
cont'd

---

NOTES

- 1/ Imports of hogs are in pounds live weight.
- 2/ Dressed weight (excluding lard) of hogs slaughtered under Federal inspection which, in the 5 calendar years 1928-32 averaged 63 percent of total slaughter.
- 3/ Cash income from hogs minus 12 percent for estimated wholesale value of lard.
- 4/ Does not include lard but imports are negligible.
- 5/ Estimated.
- 6/ Includes imports of full-duty wheat and of wheat unfit for human consumption. Imports for grinding; in bond and export are excluded.
- 7/ Number of head converted to dressed-weight basis using 82 pounds per head and a dressing ratio of 47 percent.
- 8/ Dressed weight of sheep and lambs slaughtered under Federal inspection which in the 5 calendar years 1928-32 averaged 78 percent of total slaughter.
- 9/ Unpublished estimate by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the dressed weight of chickens, turkeys, ducks, and geese sold off farms.
- 10/ Average cash income from chickens plus 1929 census farm value of turkeys, ducks, and geese. Most of the imported poultry is in the form of turkeys.
- 11/ Commercial production.
- 12/ Includes only cottonseed and cottonseed meal since imports of cottonseed oil, hulls, and linters, if any, are not separately reported.
- 13/ Not separately reported but quantity imported is probably less than 1/4 of 1 percent of commercial production.
- 14/ Quarantine prohibits entry into continental United States.
- 15/ Farm value, not cash income.
- 16/ Agricultural imports excluding forest products.
- 17/ Average cash farm income in the United States excluding forest products.

Table 6.- Group C.- Value of principal agricultural imports competing with domestic farm products of a different kind or quality that are either imported or exported, average 1929-30 to 1932-33

Imported product	Value of agricultural imports	Year beginning July 1	
		Average 1929-30 to 1932-33	
		Domestic farm product with which imports compete	Cash income from product
		1,000 dollars	1,000 dollars
Vegetable fibers, total	25,119	Cotton lint	702,952
Cotton, total	14,928		
Molasses, inedible	10,403	Corn	202,686
Farinaceous substances	3,088		
Coconut oil and copra	28,653	Inedible tallow	1/ 44,573
Palm oil	11,105		
Palm kernal oil	1,084	& grease	
Onions	450	Onions	14,222
Carpet wool dutiable	1,395	Combing and clothing wool	61,920
Tung oil	7,575	Flaxseed	22,778
Tobacco, unmanufactured	55,145	Tobacco, unmanufactured	184,032
Total, Group C	158,945		1,233,163
Total, Groups A-E	1,032,205		
Grand total	2/ 1,124,693		3/ 7,039,473

1/ Estimated.

2/ Agricultural imports excluding forest products.

3/ Average cash farm income in the United States excluding forest products.

Table 7.- Group D.-Value of principal agricultural imports competing with domestic farm products of a different kind or quality, that are not imported or exported, average 1929-30 to 1932-33

Imported product	Value of agricultural imports	Year beginning July 1	
		Average 1929-30 to 1932-33	Cash income from product
:	1,000		1,000
:	<u>dollars</u>		<u>dollars</u>
Olives, total .....	3,232	Olives, ripe, pickled	1/ 720
Dried and frozen eggs :	3,371	Chicken eggs	427,539
Cheese (Swiss and other: foreign types) .....	15,505	Cheese, total (Sheep and lamb,	1/ 64,440
Sheep and lamb skins ..:	19,580	(skins	1/ 12,500
Goat and kid skins ..:	25,273		
Total, Group D .....	66,961		505,199
Total, Groups A-E ...	1,032,205		
Grand total .....	<u>2/</u> 1,124,693		<u>3/</u> 7,039,473
:			
:			

1/ Estimated.

2/ Agricultural imports excluding forest products.

3/ Average cash farm income in the United States excluding forest products.

Table 8.- Group E.-Value of principal agricultural imports competing with domestic farm products of the same kind and quality, average 1929-30 to 1932-33

Product	Year beginning July 1-	
	Average 1929-30 to 1932-33	
	Value of imports	Cash farm income from domestic production
	<u>1,000 dollars</u>	<u>1,000 dollars</u>
Cane sugar .....	119,894	<u>1/</u> 65,090
Flaxseed .....	16,864	22,778
Wool other than carpet wool ..:	9,575	61,920
Olive oil, edible .....	9,257	<u>2/</u> 355
Cattle not for breeding .....	5,075	(
Beef and veal fresh, pickled, and canned .....	5,773	( <u>3/</u> 790,801
Cattle hides .....	15,416	(
Potatoes, white .....	3,082	164,583
Beans, dry .....	2,778	41,188
Lemons .....	1,021	17,421
Tomatoes, all forms .....	8,163	<u>4/</u> 41,989
Turnips and rutabagas .....	641	<u>5/</u> 859
Total, Group E .....	<u>197,539</u>	<u>1,206,984</u>
Total, Groups A-E .....	<u>1,032,205</u>	
Grand total .....	<u>6/</u> 1,124,693	<u>7/</u> 7,039,473

1/ Cash farm income from sugar beets for sugar and sugarcane for sirup.

2/ Estimated.

3/ Cash income from cattle and calves.

4/ Farm value, not cash value.

5/ Farm value in 1930 only.

6/ Agricultural imports excluding forest products.

7/ Average cash farm income in the United States excluding forest products.

Table 9.- Summary of the classification of agricultural imports on the basis of the probable effect of an increase in their duties on the prices of domestic farm products with which the imports compete, average 1929-30 to 1932-33

Import classification	Year beginning July 1 <u>average 1929-30 to 1932-33</u>			
	Value of agricultural imports	Estimated cash income from domestic farm products with which imports compete	Total	Total
1/	Total	Percentage of grand total	Total	Percentage of grand total
	1,000 <u>dollars</u>	<u>Percent</u>	1,000 <u>dollars</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Group A - Noncompetitive imports ..	604,226	53.7	0	0
Group B - Competitive imports that: averaged 1/4 percent or less of: domestic production .....	4,534	.4	2,900,678	41.2
Group C - Imports which compete as: substitutes with domestic farm products that are different in kind or quality, which are either exported or imported ...	158,945	14.1	1,233,163	17.5
Group D - Imports which compete as: substitutes with domestic farm products that are different in kind or quality, which are <u>not</u> exported or imported .....	66,961	6.0	505,199	7.2
Group E - Competitive imports that: are identical in kind and quality with the domestic product .....	197,539	17.6	1,206,984	17.1
Total, Groups A - E .....	1,032,205	91.8	2,5846,024	83.0
Total, not grouped .....	3/ 92,488	8.2	4/1,537,906	21.9
Total, grouped & not grouped:	1,124,693		5/7,383,930	104.9
Grand total .....	6/1,124,693	100.0	6/7,039,473	100.0

Continued -

Table 9.- Summary of the classification of agricultural imports on the basis of the probable effect of an increase in their duties on the prices of domestic farm products, with which the imports compete, average 1929-30 to 1932-33 - Cont'd

NOTES -

For lists of products included in each group

- 1/ See tables 2, 5, 6, 7, and 8.
- 2/ Includes duplication. For instance, the domestic cash farm income from flaxseed appears opposite both Group C imports (because that group includes tung oil) and opposite Group E imports (because that group includes imported flaxseed). Thus cash income from flaxseed is counted twice in "total grouped" cash income.
- 3/ All of the ungrouped imports would, if grouped, fall in one of the groups A to E inclusive.
- 4/ Ungrouped cash farm income includes cash income from two types of farm products which cannot be separated: - (1) Farm products with which no imported product competes; (2) farm products with which the ungrouped imports compete. Total ungrouped is derived by deducting total duplication as compiled from tables 5 to 8 from "total grouped" and deducting the result from grand total.
- 5/ "Total grouped" cash income, plus "ungrouped" income, add to more than "grand total" cash income, because the former includes duplication as explained in preceding footnotes. The amount of the duplication is shown by the excess of the total of "total grouped plus ungrouped" over "grand total" or \$344,457.
- 6/ Average United States cash farm income excluding forest products.

Table 10.- Tariff status as of September 1, 1936, of imported agricultural products classified on the basis of their competitive nature, specified periods

	Percentage of class total			Percentage of total classified		
	Year beginning July 1			Year beginning July 1		
Class	Average:	Average:	Average:	Average:	Average:	Average:
	: 1924-25: 1929-30:	: to :	: to :	: 1924-25: 1929-30:	: to :	: to :
	: 1928-29: 1932-33:			: 1928-29: 1932-33:		
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
<u>Class I</u>						
Imported agricultural products						
of which there is <u>no</u> domestic						
production and which are <u>not</u>						
substituted for domestic farm						
products						
A. Free 1/ .....	99.5	99.5	99.2	58.3	55.9	47.3
B. Dutiable 1/ .....	.5	.5	.8	.3	.3	.4
Total, class I .....	100.0	100.0	100.0			
<u>Class II</u>						
Imports of agricultural products						
of which there is no domestic						
production that are substituted						
for domestic farm products						
A. Free 1/ .....	28.4	26.3	38.3	1.6	1.9	2.4
B. Dutiable 1/ .....	71.6	73.7	61.7	4.1	5.4	3.9
Total, class II .....	100.0	100.0	100.0			
<u>Class III</u>						
Imports of agricultural products						
which are also produced in the						
United States						
A. Free 1/ .....	20.7	29.6	18.1	7.4	10.8	8.3
B. Dutiable 1/ .....	79.3	70.4	81.9	28.3	25.7	37.7
Total, class III .....	100.0	100.0	100.0			
<u>Total above-classified</u>						
A. Free 1/ .....	67.3	68.6	58.0	67.3	68.6	58.0
B. Dutiable 1/ .....	32.7	31.4	42.0	32.7	31.4	42.0
Total classified .....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
<u>Classes I &amp; II - no domestic production</u>						
A. Free 1/ .....	93.2	91.1	92.1	59.9	57.8	49.7
B. Dutiable 1/ .....	6.8	8.9	7.9	4.4	5.7	4.3
Total classes I & II .....	100.0	100.0	100.0			
<u>Classes II &amp; III - competitive agricultural imports</u>						
A. Free 1/ .....	21.8	29.1	20.6	9.0	12.7	10.7
B. Dutiable 1/ .....	78.2	70.9	79.4	32.4	31.1	41.6
Total competitive .....	100.0	100.0	100.0			

Continued -

Table 10.- Tariff status as of September 1, 1936, of imported agricultural products classified on the basis of their competitive nature, specified periods - Cont'd

---

NOTE -

1/ Imported agricultural products which are subject to an excise tax under Title IV of the Revenue Act of 1934 as amended are here classified as dutiable whether or not they are also subject to duty under the Tariff Act. A detailed list of the products included in each class and the tariff status of each is given in appendix I.

Appendix I-Imported agricultural products classified on the basis of whether or not the commodities are also produced in the United States and whether or not they are substituted for domestic farm products, average 1924-25 to 1928-29, 1929-30 to 1932-33, and year 1934-35

Commodity	Tariff:	Quantity-year ended June 30	Value-year ended June 30
	& tax :	Average :	Average :
	status: Unit	1924-25 to: 1929-30 to:	1924-25 to: 1929-30 to:
	1/	1928-29 : 1932-33 :	1928-29 : 1932-33 :
	Thousands	Thousands	Thousands
		: Thousands	: 1,000
			: dollars
			: dollars
			: dollars
Silk, cocoons, etc. . . . .	F	1b. : 32,012	83,635
Coffee, except into Puerto Rico 2/	F	1b. : 1,426,449	1,594,407
Rubber and similar gums 3/ . . . . .	F	1b. : 996,348	1,023,566
Bananas . . . . .	F	bunch : 58,745	55,162
Cocoa or cocoa beans and shells. . . . .	F	1b. : 411,120	437,164
Tea . . . . .	F	1b. : 94,465	89,696
Vegetable fibers, specified free 4/	F	ton : ---	188
Wool and camel's hair free . . . . .	F	lb. : 5/135,857	6/ 84,533
Spices, specified free 7/ . . . . .	F	---	---
Drugs, specified free 8/ . . . . .	F	---	---
Essential oils, specified free 9/ . . . . .	F	---	---
Vanilla beans . . . . .	D	---	---
Drugs, specified dutiable 10/ . . . . .	D	---	---
Cocoa . . . . .	D	1b. : 3,771	3,644
Chocolate . . . . .	D	1b. : 2,938	1,193
Tonka beans . . . . .	D	1b. : N.S.M.	382
Ginger root, candied, etc. . . . .	D	---	---
TOTAL CLASS I CLASSIFIED 11/			1,254,845
			604,226
			231,776

Appendix I-Imported agricultural products classified on the basis of whether or not the commodities are also produced in the United States and whether or not they are substituted for domestic farm products, average 1924-25 to 1928-29, 1929-30 to 1932-33, and year 1934-35 Cont'd.

Tariff:	Quantity-year ended June 30	Value-year ended June 30
& tax :	Average : Unit : 1924-25 to: 1929-30 to: 1934-35	Average : 1924-25 to: 1929-30 to: 1934-35
Commodity	status: 1/	status: 1928-29 : 1932-33
	: Thousands	: Thousands : 1928-29 : 1932-33
		: 1,000 : 1,000 : 1,000
		: dollars : dollars : dollars
CLASS II - NOT ALSO PRODUCED IN UNITED STATES BUT SUBSTITUTED FOR AMERICAN FARM PRODUCTS		
MISCELLANEOUS		
Jute and jute butts	F : ton : 78	55
Flex hackled & other, and hemp	D : ton : 7	6
Carpet wool dutiable	D : 1lb. : 5/ 9,925	6/ 7,172
Farinaceous substances	F : 1lb. : 135,046	144,734
Olives, total 12/	D : ----	----
Coconut meat, desiccated from	F : 1lb. : 32,518	39,194
Philippine Is.	D : 1lb. : 20,805	3,674
Cocoanut meat, desiccated, other	D : No. : 61,531	59,618
Coconuts in shell	D : ----	----
Brazil nuts, shelled and un-	D : ----	----
shelled	D : ----	----
Dried eggs, yolk and albumen	D : ----	----
Rice, patna for use in canned	F : food . . . . .	1,556
SPECIFIED VEGETABLE OILS		
Coconut oil from Philippine Is: 14/D	1lb. : 277,674	311,081
Palm oil	1lb. : 157,806	256,648
Palm kernel oil, inedible	1lb. : 54,747	18,002
Tung oil	1lb. : 96,170	98,887
Olive oil, inedible and foots	F : 1lb. : 49,359	56,061
SPECIFIED OILSEEDS		
Castor beans	14/D : 1lb. : 120,377	101,906
Copra	14/D : 1lb. : 452,410	499,854
Sesame seed	14/D : 1lb. : 15/ 9,652	34,134
Poppy seed	D : 1lb. : 5,896	6,270

Total Cases II Classified

Continued

Appendix I-Imported agricultural products classified on the basis of whether or not the commodities are also produced in the United States and whether or not they are substituted for domestic farm products, average 1924-25 to 1928-29, 1929-30 to 1932-33, and year 1934-35 Cont'd.

Continued -

Appendix I—Imported agricultural products classified on the basis of whether or not the commodities are also produced in the United States and whether or not they are substituted for domestic farm products, average 1924-25 to 1928-29, 1929-30 to 1932-33, and year 1934-35 Cont'd.

Appendix I-Imported agricultural products classified on the basis of whether or not the commodities are also produced in the United States and whether or not they are substituted for domestic farm products, average 1924-25 to 1928-29, 1929-30 to 1932-33, and year 1934-35 Cont'd.

Tariff:		Quantity-year ended June 30		Value-year ended June 30			
& tax :		Average :		Average :			
Commodity		Unit : 1924-25 to: 1929-30 to:		1924-25 to: 1929-30 to:			
1/		1928-29 : 1932-33 :		1928-29 : 1932-33 :			
		Thousands: Thousands:		Thousands : Dollars :			
		1,000 : 1,000		1,000 : 1,000			
		Dollars : Dollars :		Dollars : Dollars :			
CLASS III - IMPORTED PRODUCTS WHICH ARE ALSO PRODUCED IN UNITED STATES - CONTINUED							
<u>DAIRY PRODUCTS</u>							
Butter	D	1b.	6,519	1,752	2,393		
	D	1b.	24,844	8,276	1,784		
Casein	D	1b.	74,743	62,348	48,446		
Cheese, total	D	1b.	4,566	872	1		
Cream, fresh	D	gal.	6,089	1,204	23		
Milk, fresh	D	gal.	---	---	1,143		
Other dairy products	D	D	---	---	226		
SPECIFIED VEGETABLE OILS	D	1b.	81,930	80,824	62,552		
Olive oil, edible	D	1b.	9,735	1,434	3,085		
Linseed oil	D	1b.	4,621	8,414	59,928		
Peanut oil	D	1b.	18,624	5,584	11,344		
Soybean oil	D	1b.	---	---	1,270		
OILS AND FATS, ANIMAL	D	1b.	8,006	1,283	8,844		
Edible animal oils and fats	D	1b.	30/	6,352	4,294		
Stearic acid	D	35/	31/	926	30/		
Tallow, total beef and mutton	D	1b.	10,741	5,718	190,138		
Wool grease	D	1b.	---	4,531	4,531		
Grease and oils, inedible, n.e.s.	D	1b.	---	---	468		
VEGETABLES	D	1b.	91,376	96,600	76,286		
Tomatoes, canned	D	1b.	103,627	108,652	77,160		
Tomatoes, natural state	D	1b.	14,561	12,928	12,233		
Tomato paste	D	1b.	224,967	205,026	31,929.		
Potatoes, white	D	1b.	92,566	63,875	34,814		
Beans, dry	D	1b.	133,256	106,296	91,726		
Turnips and rutabagas	D	1b.	114,163	26,646	14,392		
Onions	D	1b.	18,906	11,231	7,478		
Peas, dried	D	1b.	---	---	845		

Continued -

Appendix I-Imported agricultural products classified on the basis of whether or not the commodities are also produced in the United States and whether or not they are substituted for domestic farm products, average 1924-25 to 1928-29, 1929-30 to 1932-33, and year 1934-35 Cont'd.

Commodity	Tariff: :& tax : status: 1/	Quantity-year ended June 30 Thousands : Thousands	Value-year ended June 30 Thousands : Dollars
<b>CLASS III - IMPORTED PRODUCTS WHICH ARE ALSO PRODUCED IN UNITED STATES - CONTINUED</b>			
<b>LIVE ANIMALS</b>			
Cattle for breeding	F : No.	7	11
Cattle, other	D : No.	340	169
Hogs not for breeding	D : 1b. : <u>13/</u> 14,376	186	234
Horses for breeding	D : No. : <u>13/</u> 1 <u>32/</u>	<u>32/</u>	<u>13/</u> 1,637
Horses, other	D : No. : <u>13/</u> 2	2	5 <u>13/</u> 1,272
Sheep and goats	D : No. : <u>33/</u> 42	3	4 <u>33/</u> 571
Poultry, live	D : 1b. : 1,844 <u>34/</u>	409	5 <u>34/</u> 435
<b>SPECIFIED MEATS</b>			
Beef and veal, fresh, pickled and canned	D : 1b. : <u>35/</u> 68,619	50,190	75,750 <u>35/</u> 8,238
Pork, total, separately reported	D : 1b. : <u>37/</u> 10,720	4,941	3,988 <u>37/</u> 2,375
Poultry, total separately rep'd	D : 1b. : 4,722	3,374	857 1,547
Mutton and lamb	D : 1b. : 3,134	551	30 518
<b>SPECIFIED FRUITS</b>			
Dates, dried	D : 1b. : 28,129	46,850	53,781 2,683
Other dried fruits	D : 1b. : 56,485	22,462	13,432 4,056
Apples, fresh	D : bu. : 136	122	28 213
Berries, natural or in brine	D : 1b. : 5,743	5,731	3,862 482
Cherries, natural, sulphured, etc.	D : 1b. : 8,377	9,483	1,492 1,964
Grapefruit	D : 1b. : 12,854	8,720	7,646 326
Lemons	D : 1b. : 72,075	35,172	628 1,839
Limes	D : 1b. : 4,592	4,878	6,065 119
Grapes, fresh	D : cu.ft. : 124	243	606 368

Continued -

Appendix I-Imported agricultural products classified on the basis of whether or not the commodities are also produced in the United States and whether or not they are substituted for domestic farm products,  
average 1924-25 to 1928-29, 1929-30 to 1932-33, and year 1934-35 Cont'd.

"D" signifies that as of September 1, 1936 the item was either dutiable or subject to an excise tax under Title IV of the Revenue Act of 1935 as amended, or both dutiable and taxable. "F" signifies the item was subject to neither a duty nor to the excise tax mentioned.  
Prior to January 1935, includes a small amount of coffee imported free into Puerto Rico.  
Does not include reclaimed and scrap rubber.  
Includes a small amount of crin vegetal which is dutiable. Includes all reported vegetable fibers other than

jute, jute butts, flax hacked and other, and hemp. Imports for consumption, average of the five calendar years 1925-1929. Imports for consumption, average of the four calendar years 1930-1933. Includes caraway seed, pepper, black and white, alspice unground, cinnamon, cloves, ginger root not prepared or preserved, mace, nutmeg, and cassia and cassia vera. Includes chinchona bark, licorice root, pyrethrum flowers, and senna.

Continued

NOTES: Cont'd.

- 9/ Includes bergamot, citronella and lemongrass, geranium, lavender and spike lavender, and attar of roses.  
10/ Includes licorice extract and crude opium.  
11/ The following noncompetitive items have not been listed here but have been left in "unclassified" because not separately reported, or because of minor importance or for other reasons: Plantains, certain spices, yerba mate, certain drugs, certain essential oils, vegetable ivory or tagua nuts, Brazilian or pichurim beans, locust or carob beans pods and seeds, waste tea for manufacture, and broomroot.  
12/ Includes green, ripe, pitted or stuffed olives in brine and dried and other olives. Very few ripe olives in brine are imported.  
13/ Average of last 4 years of period.  
14/ Free of duty, but subject to an excise tax under Title IV of the Revenue Act of 1934 as amended.  
15/ Average of last 3 years of period.  
16/ Includes both edible and inedible molasses except a small amount of inedible molasses free from the Philippines.  
17/ Actual weight.  
18/ Includes a negligible amount of seed free for use of Department of Agriculture and prior to July 1, 1927 included small amount of cowpeas free of duty.  
19/ Includes capsicum unground, celery seed, mustard ground and unground, and paprica.  
20/ Not separately reported prior to June 18, 1930 but dutiable and included in "wheat, full duty" listed under "grains".  
21/ Imports for consumption, average of the 3 years 1930-31 through 1932-33.  
22/ Other than copra or coconut oilcake and oilcake meal.  
23/ A negligible amount of crude bristles free of duty are included in all years except 1930-31, 1931-32, and 1932-33.  
24/ Includes a small amount of rice free of duty from Philippine Islands and for supplies of vessels.  
25/ Imports for consumption. Includes wheat unfit for human consumption prior to June 18, 1930.  
26/ Average of the 3 years beginning July 1, 1930.  
27/ Average of the calendar years 1924-28.  
28/ Includes condensed and evaporated, dried and malted milk and cream.  
29/ Includes lard, lard compounds, oleo oil, oleo stearin and oleomargarine.  
30/ Included in "Greases and oils, inedible, n.e.s."  
31/ Based on 1931-32 and 1932-33 only.  
32/ Less than 500.  
33/ Does not include goats.  
34/ Does not include small amount of poultry other than turkeys.  
35/ Does not include beef and veal pickled prior to January 1, 1928.  
36/ Includes pork fresh, hams, shoulders and bacon, and pork pickled, salted, and other prepared or preserved pork.  
37/ Includes fresh pork only prior to January 1, 1928.  
38/ Includes dead and fresh turkeys, dead and fresh other poultry, prepared or preserved poultry. After January 1, 1930 also includes game birds dead, fresh, and prepared or preserved.